

ITEM II

Approval of Minutes
October 20, 2014

Anthony Abbate
Chairperson

DRAFT
BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2014 – 2:30 P.M.

MEMBERS	FEB 2014/JAN 2015				
		REGULAR MTGS		SPECIAL MTGS	
		Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Anthony Abbate, Chair	P	5	0	3	0
Ina Lee, Vice Chair	P	4	1	3	0
Thomas B. McManus	P	2	1	3	0
Dan Matchette	P	5	0	3	0
Melissa Milroy	P	3	2	3	0
Judith Scher	P	5	0	3	0
Tim Schiavone	A	4	1	2	1
Andy Mitchell, Jr.	P	3	1	2	1
Shirley Smith	P	4	0	3	0
Aiton Yaari	A	3	2	2	1

Staff

Lee Feldman, City Manager, ICMA-CM
Don Morris, Economic Reinvestment Administrator
Eileen Furedi, Clerk II
Laura Voet, Aquatics Director
Lisa Edmondson, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Guests and Presenters

Bernard Zyscovich, RDC
Jim Blosser, RDC
Joe Cerrone, RDC
Mario Suarez, RDC
Steve Foley, U.S.A. Diving
Frank Busch, U.S.A. Swimming
Mike Leonard, YMCA of USA

Members of Parks, Recreation and Beaches Board:

- Bruce Quailey, Chair
- Angela Ward, Vice Chair
- Colette Keno
- Darin Lentner
- Karen Polivka
- Joseph Bellavance
- Steven Buckingham

- Karen Doyle
- Caleb Henry Gunter
- Betty Shelley
- Michael A. West, Jr.
- Debbie Eisenger
- JoAnn Medalie
- Larry Mabson

I. Call to Order/Roll Call – Anthony Abbate, Chair

Chair Abbate called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

Quorum Requirement

As of this date there were 10 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 would constitute a quorum. It was noted there was a quorum at the commencement of the meeting.

Chair Abbate requested changing the Agenda order to address Item V (Discuss Aquatics Center Design) before Items III and IV.

Communications to the City Commission - None

II. Approval of Minutes – Anthony Abbate, Chair

- **August 4, 2014 / Regular Meeting**

Motion made by Mr. Matchette, seconded by Ms. Scher, to approve the minutes of the August 4, 2014, meeting with the following correction:

- p. 6, paragraph 1, second line, add “less than 1%” in parentheses after “very few people”

In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

- **September 4, 2014 / Special Meeting**

Motion made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Mitchell, to approve the minutes of the September 4, 2014, meeting as presented. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

III. Bahia Mar Pedestrian Bridge Renovation – to be addressed later

IV. DC Alexander Park Concepts - to be addressed later

V. Discuss Aquatics Center Design – Bernard Zyscovich, Design Consultant for RDC

Chair Abbate advised the Board that this is an informational presentation, not something requiring a vote at this meeting.

Jim Blosser, RDC, stated he has worked with the design team at RDC for several years. Mr. Blosser provided highlights of the project over the past five years.

- Acreage is owned by State, and the City has a lease right to the site
- Lease required that the site be the home to the Swimming Hall of Fame
- City has to go back to trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund in Tallahassee for a variance for having an Aquatics Center without the Swimming Hall of Fame
- Original proposal was for \$74 million without any qualification
 - Joint public/private partnership
- Original RFP included DC Alexander Park
 - Theme was designed to generate more aquatic interest
 - Garage was on south side with Aquatic Complex deck at or above grade
 - Ran into opposition by neighbors
- City decided highest and best use would be replacement of the Aquatics Center
- City staff developed proposal including a small hotel, restaurants, etc.
 - Rejected by the City Commission
- City negotiated for several years with the Hall of Fame to retain them onsite
 - Their financial demands were too great for the City, and were ceased
- RDC is responding to the City and various boards to try to give the City what it wants within budget constraints
- \$25 million budget set by BRAB out of CRA funds
- City wanted more parking, and would fund a garage out of the parking fund
 - Garage required more elevation and change in design
- \$25 million budget did not allow for two pools to be on the new deck
- Current 50-meter pool on east side was saved for cost-effectiveness
- U.S. Diving Association, U.S. Swimming have signed off on the new design
- Local dive and swim teams have been consulted
- Neighbors have been consulted
- City has officially signed off on the project

Mr. Blosser reviewed a concern brought up at the last meeting of this Board: Board is charged with three basic core components in the Master Plan:

1. World-class atmosphere for residents/visitors
2. Revitalize business
3. Promote pedestrian activity

Mr. Blosser pointed out there is a promenade around the facility, and it is narrow on Seabreeze so the City staff could retain green space for activities/events.

Joe Cerrone, RDC, introduced Mario Suarez (partner), who is managing the project until closure. Mr. Cerrone said they are present in the “spirit of cooperation” and trying to work within the limited budget.

Mr. Cerrone continued that there is a big financial benefit in being able to reuse the existing Olympic pool on the eastern edge, but they have examined alternatives to that plan at the request of the City Manager and others.

Mr. Cerrone began a PowerPoint presentation at 2:55 pm. on the design scheme, focusing on diagrams of “before and after.” In response to a question, Mr. Cerrone commented that the training pool is at grade, and the competition pool and dive pool are at 50 feet. He continued that by placing the pool in the deck, it is easier to keep it from “floating.” By having part of the dive pool above grade, they do not have to dig down as much into the aquifer. The existing 50 meter pool would be demolished.

Mr. Feldman, City Manager, stated they are still having discussions with Red Bull consultants on the diving platforms; they want the platform on the north side (facing south) so that it would not be part of the 10-meter platform for operational reasons.

Mr. Zyscovich continued the presentation, showing the dive platform, garage design, and pool placement of the revised design. The PowerPoint presentation was concluded at 3:07 p.m.

Mr. Zyscovich noted that “world-class” is in the eye of the beholder, but the site itself is definitely world class – the design takes advantage of that. He emphasized that they have vetted “every single element” and feel confident that the revised project is compliant with all the intentions of the users.

Mr. Matchette brought up some concerns, such as athletes climbing up stairs before events, or walking through air conditioned spaces after being in the water. He wondered if they could locate all three pools in the same deck. Mr. Zyscovich responded that would necessitate a complete redesign and reduce the open space near the street. In addition, he said that the swimmers and divers would be warming up in the dive pool, and would be able to go directly from the dive pool to the competition pool. It was not expected that there would be a diving competition simultaneously with a swimming competition.

Mr. Feldman introduced Aquatics Director Laura Voet, Steve Foley (U.S.A. Diving), Frank Busch (U.S.A. Swimming), Mike Leonard (YMCA of USA), and coaches for Fort Lauderdale Swimming and Fort Lauderdale Diving.

Mr. Matchette asked if the competing organizations had seen the plan, noting that movement in the diver’s peripheral vision might prove distracting. Mr. Busch responded that from a swimmer’s perspective, all that is necessary for a world-class facility is a competition pool, some type of warm-up opportunity, and the appropriate amount of

space available for the athletes and their staff. Mr. Busch stated the proposed facility is “outstanding for the deck space” and the way the three pools are designed.

Regarding generation of room-nights, Mr. Busch said they do not bring them in per se - they put their events out for bid. He said they look at newly renovated or new facilities to kick-start their event status. Mr. Busch added that compared to what is available across the country, he would not hesitate to bring events here.

Mr. Busch suggested several freight-size elevators to move equipment and athletes to different levels. It was pointed out there are currently three elevators designed for the building – two are for passengers, one is for freight.

Mr. Busch stated he came to Fort Lauderdale to endorse what he thinks will be a world-class facility, with the potential for three pools. He added other unique facilities are being built around the world, but the proximity to the Intracoastal and the “magnificent design” are big draws. He noted that a new facility in Belmont Shores, California, will cost \$103 million.

A question was raised as to whether anything in this facility would increase the likelihood of world records being broken. Mr. Busch said that the facilities meet the requirements from FINA, and what is important to him also is a good spectator area and a good situation for television. It was noted that the pool system is the fastest pool system in the world.

It was pointed out that escalators could be a liability problem due to people wearing flip flops, and they are also problematic being outside.

Regarding the effect of wind on the diving platform, it was noted that the FIU study showed only a two percent difference in the wind speed, making it a moot issue.

Steve Foley, US National High Performance Diving Director, said that synchronized diving is coming, and high dive is coming also – this could be the first facility in the world for that and become a world training center for high diving.

Chair Abbate reminded the Board that their purview is just to administer the Master Plan and Beach Redevelopment Plan – they should not be judging architecture, pool circulation, etc. How the design meets the requirements of the plan should be the Board’s task. He stated that the plan discourages parking garages on the Intracoastal, and wondered how the garage would be screened from view, such as by flipping the design.

Ms. Lee verified that Mr. Foley did have a concern about the diving platform being on top of the parking garage, as specified in the original plan. Mr. Foley elaborated having the platform there might create difficulty bringing in international meets. He commented that drivers might be distracted looking at the divers.

Ms. Smith thought three floors of parking was “overkill.” It was noted the facility itself requires a large number of parking spaces.

Discussion ensued on the effect of wind speed on platform diving, with Mr. Foley saying that there is no hard and fast rule as to when too much wind is too much, but the head coach would be involved in any such decision. The following comments were made:

- Winds change direction with the seasons, and the north wind in the winter could be funneled off the garage toward the dive tower (in the winter)
- Many options for the placement of the platform were discussed during planning
 - Having it in the back was discarded because it would be in the “back yards” of the neighbors
- USA Diving supported the current location because the building becomes a wind block, and the dive structure becomes a block from the south
- Landscaping can be used as a solution

Chair Abbate wanted to hear more remarks about how the facility will promote pedestrian activity and revitalize business. He said he heard at this meeting that the garage was the answer to revitalizing business. Mr. Cerrone responded that may be the case, and the other is that the walkability to the hotels is a plus. He commented that the CVB said 200,000 room nights could be associated with the completed facility. Mr. Zyscovich thought it would be good for business because it was an active parks and recreation use.

Mr. Cerrone mentioned that part of the reason the front of the area is grassy is that the Boat Show wants to use it. Also, children, tents, and vendors could use that area during a swim/dive competition in a festival-type setting.

Laura Voet stated that sporting events in the County create about 600,000 room nights a year; 60,000 or ten percent were attributed to the Aquatics Center in the past. Ms. Lee cautioned rooms are more expensive now.

Mike Leonard, Competitive Swimming and Diving Committee for the YMCA of USA, stated they look forward to coming back to Fort Lauderdale – the families of the athletes like coming to Fort Lauderdale and the beach. Mr. Leonard noted the following:

- Their first meets are the first week in April (short course national meet)
 - 1500-1600 athletes plus families
- Master’s Nationals in April-May (600-700 athletes)
 - All stay on the beach
- Everyone in the YMCA wants to come back to Fort Lauderdale
- Original design looks very good to them

In response to a question if plexiglass barrier could be used to shield the diving platform from wind, Mr. Foley said it might help, but the events would normally occur in the spring or summer.

Members of the Parks, Recreation and Beaches Board then commented on the following points:

- The facility is built on pilings which will be removed and/or replaced
 - The facility weighs “thousands of tons”
 - Engineering shows the area is capable of supporting the structure
- Pool will be good for triathletes also (for training and Master’s swimming)
- Parking is based on the seasons – parking has been difficult in the past
- Several bicycle parking areas are designated (inside garage and along the back side of the garage around the perimeter)
- The plan does not show the Red Bull tower
 - A tower on top of the parking lot would be affected more by the wind, but minimally, as the divers are daredevils to begin with
 - Economic impact would be great
- Moving the dive pool to the front was prompted by a suggestion from the Mayor (to eliminate the separation between the warm-up area and the competition area)

Mr. Feldman remarked that the Red Bull tower would be a good place for cliff divers to train (the wind is always a factor for cliff divers).

It was asked how to prevent drivers from gawking at the “Red Bull” divers, and Mr. Foley acknowledged it would be difficult if it were in the front of the facility.

Ms. Lee brought up the wrapping of the garage. Mr. Cerrone said they have a tight budget to work with, and have a plan to modify the design in the future. (He distributed a handout to that effect.) It would cost over \$1 million to screen the garage.

Chair Abbate pointed out that screening the garage is in the Master Plan and criteria; if they cannot meet it, a variance would have to be requested. He said he would appreciate it if the design presentation would address the Master Plan criteria. Chair Abbate reiterated that his position is that it is a design challenge, but not a budget or an aesthetic issue.

Mr. Matchette reviewed the self-sustaining ability of the project, and asked if the City has a business plan and what the City would do to pull in new business. He continued that Mr. Blosser mentioned that the City Commission designated this property’s highest and best use is as an aquatics center. Mr. Matchette wondered if that was a directive from the City Commission based on what they want, or if there was a methodology of what is the highest and best use.

Mr. Feldman reviewed the history of the property, noting it was originally State property that was deeded to the City for the purpose of building an aquatics center/Hall of Fame. Eventually some relief will need to be sought on the deed since they will not have a Hall of Fame, although he said he was not worried about it. He felt they did need to honor

the basic plan to have the aquatics facility there. Ms. Voet read from a document regarding the property.

Mr. Feldman continued that he had made it clear to the City Commission that the facilities are recreational in nature. He stated they expect to have approximately \$1 million in subsidy from the City, with the greatest part of that being spent on staffing, such as lifeguards, maintenance, etc. He said the parking facility should pay for itself with regard to the debt service. Additional revenue should go into the parking fund, which would have a return and go back into the general fund to help offset the subsidy.

Mr. Feldman reviewed the tourism aspect, facility reputation, etc. He was confident they would get business back, as people are already inquiring about the facility. Mr. Feldman said the pool could be made self-sufficient by raising fees, but then many people would not be able to use it. It was noted that the newer facility would be a big draw.

Mr. Quailey (Parks, Recreation and Beaches Board) commented that the facility should be "architecturally iconic," to dress up the City and help attract world-class meets.

Mr. Matchette explained that his questions were derived from the last meeting, and were not meant to be critical of the project. Mr. Feldman commented they could have hired a consultant for \$40,000, but did not follow up on that because the plans for a facility were continually changing. He said that would be an option when the plans are more solid.

Chair Abbate opened the floor to public comment on this item at 4:10 p.m.

Doug Coolman (Broward Workshop), 1911 Bayview Drive, Fort Lauderdale, asked about how much parking is needed, saying that the height of the pools is determined by the need for parking. Mr. Feldman replied the design has 542 spaces - some of that parking is needed for Barrier Island beachgoers as well as for those using the facility.

Fred Carlson, Vice-President of Central Beach Alliance commented as follows:

- The banquet facility would be available to the community
- Parking fees necessary to recoup the building cost would be too much for the residents
- Liked the ground-level pool for showing active events going on
- Facilities for TV towers absent
- Front bleacher space is minimal

Art Seitz, 1905 N. Atlantic Boulevard, Fort Lauderdale, commented as follows:

- Former member of BRAB
- Wave House was bankrupt in 2010 and later foreclosed
- Property could be used for a 3-star restaurant, not a garage
- Connect two peninsulas for parking

- An editorial in the *Sun Sentinel* listed several problems with project
- Projected change from \$76.1 million to \$20 million
- Reverse bleachers to see the Intracoastal view
- Water park features were eliminated after planning
- Connect pool to Bahia Mar with restaurants “all along”
- Need sunscreening cover over pool and spectator area
- Maybe have promenade under bleachers for view
- Use top of parking garage for events to tie in with economic development
- Pool is too plain
- Need more interesting places along the Intracoastal
 - Trailhead?
- Need restaurant and/or hotel rooms onsite
- Put TV in dive well
- Read *Ten Links* by Earl Rynerson

Chair Abbate closed the floor to public comment on this item at 4:24 p.m.

Ms. Lee was curious if there was a way to view the Intracoastal. It was noted there was a Promenade at the ground level, and there is a viewing opportunity at the upper level. She also wanted to have a discussion about having a “regular” kitchen rather than a catering kitchen. Mr. Feldman commented that the present kitchen is a warming kitchen, and building a regular kitchen would take away from the size of the banquet facility and also trigger other code issues. He thought there may be a conflict between the caterer getting enough work there and municipal use.

It was pointed out that this facility is mainly for recreation, not for drawing people in for an evening out. It would draw athletes not only for competitions, but for training. Athletes are not looking for a sit-down facility to eat – they usually bring their own food.

Chair Abbate replied that the Board is spending about one-half of their budget for this facility towards redevelopment of the entire Central Beach. He felt the facility had to do more than just be a training and recreation facility.

Mr. Mitchell said he was still concerned about parking and hoped people would walk and enjoy the beach rather than drive. He wanted to see a demonstration of the pedestrian flow for the project. Mr. Morris stated that all the moving parts would be presented on October 27, 2014, so they could see how it works together.

III. Bahia Mar Pedestrian Bridge Renovation (\$124,241.00) – Diana Alarcon, Transportation & Mobility Director

Ms. Alarcon explained that the bridge would connect the Bahia Mar Hotel to the beach parking lot. They have been working with the new ownership of Bahia Mar to improve the bridge, and dollars are identified in the Community Investment Plan.

Ms. Alarcon gave a PowerPoint presentation on the various design concepts for the bridge featuring LED lighting and a "Welcome" sign. Option 1 showed a perforated metal screen, while Option 2 was a solid screen.

Ms. Alarcon said that the LED lighting is not a message board, but is backlighting. She continued that Bahia Mar is contributing 30% of the cost for the signs and the City is contributing 70%. The total cost with the LED lighting is around \$650,000, and there will be a slight shortfall between what is budgeted and what would have to be contributed.

Ms. Alarcon said it might be possible to have messages on the LED lighting, with advertisers contributing funds.

Mr. Morris clarified that the City is requesting that the CRA contribute \$124,241.00 towards part of the City's cost (to help with the shortfall).

Ms. Lee emphasized that the Board needs to view this in light of what it would make available to them in the future and felt the dollars would be worth spending to do it right.

Ms. Alarcon cautioned they have to be careful with the LED lighting in regards to turtles, and she will research it. She also mentioned that the light colors could be changed with the seasons.

Mr. Morris stated the Board did not have to make a decision at the meeting, but should indicate support (or not) for the project.

Ms. Alarcon commented they are asking that this bridge not go any lower than the existing vehicular bridge with its height restriction. She said large vehicles have another way to access the property.

Chair Abbate opened the floor for public comment on this item at 4:45 p.m.

Art Seitz spoke in favor of an electronic sign with changing messages integrated into the design.

Darin Lentner, Parks and Recreation Board, was opposed to a message board, citing the need for an iconic display to attract tourists.

Chair Abbate closed the floor for public comment on this item at 4:47 p.m.

It was noted that most of the Board members preferred Option 1. Ms. Alarcon stated that the concepts would go back before the City Commission, and she would let them know the preference of the Board.

Mr. Morris reminded all present of the joint meeting with the BRAB and the City Commission on October 27, 2014. Ms. Lee felt that parking was the critical item, and she needed input from the Transportation & Mobility Department.

It was pointed out that the balance between private and public parking is critical. Studies have been done on revenue counts at the four different lots (South Beach, Intracoastal lots, and Oceanside) as well as new counts at key intersections at peak hours. Ms. Alarcon added that they are using Walker Parking Consultant, who is very familiar with Fort Lauderdale.

In response to a question, Ms. Alarcon said that the City has the ability for developers to employ a shared-use concept for parking.

IV. DC Alexander Park Concepts – Paul Kissinger, EDSA and Jeff Suiter, EDSA

Mr. Kissinger showed an aerial view of DC Alexander Park and said that feedback was given at a public meeting several months prior. Programmatic elements that arose were a flexible open space (oasis-like), special events of a variety of sizes scaled to the size of DC Alexander Park, and right infrastructure in place.

Mr. Kissinger advised that they had looked at what happens around the perimeter of the island. He said that what they see in this presentation is what has been submitted to the City.

Mr. Suiter described the overall plan, emphasizing the water, waves and the Intracoastal. They feel it is important that the Park becomes the “front yard” to the Aquatics Center.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Suiter presented Option A (modern take on the wave concept) and Option B (droplets of water concept). He pointed out that feedback has pointed them in the direction of “under-stated,” functional, elegant, and diversified.

Mr. Matchette asked about the “catchment basin” / aquatic planting retention area. Mr. Suiter replied that the area is not a wet basin, but could catch rainwater. Mr. Matchette also commented that the park as planned is not accessible to someone on crutches – it is too far to walk. He suggested a drop-off point for a person with handicaps. Mr. Suiter said that could be an easy fix, although it would take off a little street parking. Ms. Alarcon advised that the parallel parking by the Aquatics Center was meant to manage the buses carrying children on field trips, and would be a flexible use area.

Ms. Lee requested that whatever plantings are put on the north end would not prohibit events from spreading out into the street. Mr. Suiter commented they are using pedestrian-oriented “flush” conditions (as opposed to sidewalks and curbs). He said the trees were not in the way.

Mr. Mitchell said the flowing/circular nature of the plan was relaxing and reflective of the whole beach feel.

Ms. Lee suggested they not use the term “rain drops” because of the “Hello Sunny” campaign.

Steve Buckingham, Parks, Recreation and Beaches Board, was curious if there is a cost estimate on this concept; Mr. Kissinger replied it will be presented on October 27, 2014.

Mr. Kissinger commented that their new designs are the result of feedback from a survey that the City distributed, a public meeting, several BRAB meetings, and two meetings with the City Manager and staff. Mr. Suiter added they had to fit the project in with the other plans.

Chair Abbate thought that a palm tree was not a shade tree, and he only saw two trees on the plan. Secondly, he said there is a lot of traffic noise on the property, and falling water or another water element would help mitigate that noise. Mr. Kissinger commented they could try accommodating more shade trees, but the main reason the water came out is budgetary. They are trying to get the “biggest bang for the buck.” Chair Abbate hoped that if the water features were added to the plan, but not affordable, maybe someone or a company would sponsor/pay for the water feature along with naming rights. He encouraged the team to add the water features to the plan, rather than be so restricted by the budget.

Discussion ensued on the budgetary constraints, with ideas about public/private partnerships, bond issues, etc.

Art Seitz spoke about the abundance of money available from the private sector, and advised the Board to “quit thinking small.” He also suggested using Bahia Mar for temporary parking.

Mr. Kissinger encouraged the Board to speak up at the City Commission combined meeting about their design ideas, because it will eventually be about dollars.

V. Discuss Aquatics Center Design – previously addressed

VI. Communications to the City Commission - none

VII. Old/New Business

Hearing no further business, Chair Abbate adjourned the meeting at 5:27 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by J. Rubin, Prototype, Inc.]

Beach Redevelopment Board

October 20, 2014

Page 13

Attachments:

PowerPoint presentation on the Aquatics Center design – Joe Cerrone, RDC

Handout on garage screening design – Joe Cerrone

PowerPoint presentation on Bahia Mar Pedestrian Bridge – Diana Alarcon

PowerPoint presentation on DC Alexander Park Concepts – Paul Kissinger/Jeff Suiter, EDSA

ITEM IV

Beach CRA Projected Revenue
FY2016 – FY2020

Emilie Smith
Budget Manager

Fort Lauderdale Beach Community Redevelopment Agency

Revenue Projection 11/17/2014

Revenues Projected at 5.60% Increase

REVENUE SOURCES

Tax Increment Revenue (TIF)	FY 2015	FY 2016 Projected	FY 2017 Projected	FY 2018 Projected	FY 2019 Projected	FY 2020 Projected	Total Projected
City of Fort Lauderdale	2,449,463	2,586,633	2,731,484	2,884,447	3,045,977	3,216,551	16,914,556
Intergovernmental Revenue (County, etc)	4,571,212	4,827,200	5,097,523	5,382,984	5,684,431	6,002,760	31,566,110
Appropriated Fund Balance	1,537,071						
Total Tax Increment Revenues	8,557,746	7,413,833	7,829,007	8,267,432	8,730,408	9,219,311	50,017,737
Other Revenues							
Earned Interest	23,080	23,000	22,000	21,000	20,000	19,000	128,080
Total Other Revenues	23,080	23,000	22,000	21,000	20,000	19,000	128,080
Total Sources	\$ 8,580,826	\$ 7,436,833	\$ 7,851,007	\$ 8,288,432	\$ 8,750,408	\$ 9,238,311	\$ 50,145,817

OPERATING EXPENSES & CAPITAL PROJECT CONTRIBUTION

Operating Budget	FY 2015 Budget	FY 2016 Projected	FY 2017 Projected	FY 2018 Projected	FY 2019 Projected	FY 2020 Projected	Total Projected
Personnel Expenditures (6% Annual Increase)	461,148	485,203	510,701	537,729	566,378	596,747	3,157,906
Operating Expenditures (5% Annual Increase)	510,580	536,109	562,914	591,060	620,613	651,644	3,472,921
Special Events Budget	371,000	371,000	371,000	371,000	371,000	371,000	2,226,000
Total Operating Expenditures	1,342,728	1,392,312	1,444,615	1,499,789	1,557,992	1,619,391	8,856,827
Capital Project Contribution FY 2015 - FY 2020	7,238,098	6,044,521	6,406,392	6,788,643	7,192,416	7,618,920	41,288,990
Total Uses	\$ 8,580,826	\$ 7,436,833	\$ 7,851,007	\$ 8,288,432	\$ 8,750,408	\$ 9,238,311	\$ 50,145,817

5 YEAR COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PLAN (CIP)

Project Title	UNSPENT BALANCE 10/23	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	TOTAL CIP
NEW AQUATICS CENTER/PARKING GARAGE	23,505,442	-	-	-	-	-	23,505,442
SOUTH BEACH PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT	550,000	-	-	-	-	-	550,000
BEACH IMPROVEMENTS	333,787	-	-	-	-	-	333,787
BEACH WALL DECORATIVE LIGHTING SYSTEM	103,218	-	-	-	-	-	103,218
CENTRAL BCH WAYFINDING & INFO SIGNAGE	450,000	-	-	-	-	-	450,000
BAHIA MAR MARINA DREDGING PROJECT	82,597	-	1,638,000	-	-	-	1,720,597
LASOLAS MARINA & AQUATIC C DREDGE P1 MAT	199,289	-	2,921,000	-	-	-	3,120,289
ALMOND AVENUE STREETScape	2,188,297	-	-	-	-	-	2,188,297
INTRACOASTAL PROMENADE	8,533,240	-	-	-	-	-	8,533,240
SEBASTIAN ST/ALHAMBRA ST PARKING GARAGE	2,282,982	-	-	-	-	-	2,282,982
SR A1A STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS	852,162	6,230,500	-	-	-	-	7,082,662
CHANNEL SQUARE	34,767	-	-	-	-	-	34,767
LAS OLAS BLVD CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS	5,046,933	-	16,500,000	-	-	-	21,546,933
DC ALEXANDER PARK IMPROVEMENTS	1,070,670	5,359,975	-	-	-	-	6,430,645
FORT LAUDERDALE BEACH PARK RENOVATIONS	1,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	1,000,000
SOUTH BEACH ELECTRICAL IMPROVEMENTS	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	50,000
	\$ 46,283,385	\$ 11,590,475	\$ 21,059,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 78,932,860

Capital Project Contribution

FY 2016 - FY 2020

6,044,521

6,406,392

6,788,643

7,192,416

7,618,920

34,050,892

TOTAL PROJECTED AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS THROUGH CRA SUNSET

\$80,334,278

ITEM V

Central Beach Regional Activity Center (RAC) Land Use:
Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment
Funding Request \$34,726.00

Ella Parker, AICP
Urban Design & Land Use Manager

DATE: November 17, 2014

TO: Donald Morris, Economic Reinvestment Manager

FROM: Ella Parker, AICP Urban Design & Planning Manager

RE: Central Beach Regional Activity Center (RAC) Land Use: Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) – Request of Beach CRA Funding in Amount of \$34,726.00, FY 14-15

Item

Request of funds necessary to generate a Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) application for Central Beach RAC including consulting services, application fees, and costs associated with public notices.

Intent

To amend the method of tracking development and redevelopment in the Beach RAC by eliminating tracking vehicular trips, in favor of establishing maximum development thresholds based on a multi-modal analysis with focus on a pedestrian-friendly, multi-modal environment.

Background

The City and County Land Use Plans contain the approved density and intensity of land uses for the Central Beach RAC based on the Fort Lauderdale Beach Action Plan, as approved by the Broward County Commission. Currently, development is restricted to the equivalent of no more than 3,220 peak hour vehicular trips. Tracking vehicular trips is part of a roadway-based concurrency system, which was in place when the Central Beach RAC was adopted, and was used to ensure transportation infrastructure was improved concurrent with development in the RAC.

Since then, the County has adopted a transit-based concurrency system and the City has opted to operate as a transit-based concurrency district, including Central Beach. This system allows the County to collect fees on proposed developments to mitigate their impacts based on established level of service standards. Fees are used for transit improvements and/or funding transportation management systems. The system in place now is very different than the roadway-based concurrency system. Utilizing vehicular trips as a threshold for development is no longer practical with the current system in place and Central Beach evolving into a walkable, pedestrian-friendly, multi-modal environment.

Therefore, the City is seeking to amend the Central Beach RAC land use to allow the future development and redevelopment based on a maximum development threshold. The amendment would eliminate tracking vehicular trips and propose a maximum number of dwelling units and nonresidential square footage, consistent with all other Regional Activity Centers in the City; based on a multi-modal trip generation methodology.

Funding Justification

The rationale for requesting funds is based on several components; (1) this effort is consistent with the overall goals of the Beach CRA, (2) the land use amendment will provide the regulatory framework for

future development and redevelopment, (3) will continue economic growth through the built environment, (4) supports the public investment, (5) promotes a vibrant, active, multi-modal beach community, (6) greater citywide economic impact based on development, tourism, and spending, and (7) continues to make beach a desirable destination for residents, tourists, and private investment.

Recognizing that the Central Beach RAC extends beyond the boundaries of the Beach CRA, the requested funds are a proportionate amount. To determine the amount, planning staff conducted an analysis on the amount of vacant property, surface parking lots, and potential redevelopment of certain City properties such as Bahia Mar and Las Olas Intercoastal lot. As shown below, the majority of redevelopment potential is located in the Beach CRA boundaries and accounts for 84% of vacant and underutilized land. Further detail on this analysis can be found on the attachments.

Table 1: Underutilized Land Use Analysis

	Acreage	Percentage
Non-CRA Properties	10.45	16%
CRA Properties	53.61	84%
TOTAL	64.06	100%

Using this approach, the following table provides a cost breakdown and utilizes the 84% to determine the requested funding amount of \$34,726.

Table 2: Cost Summary

Item	Total Cost	Proportionate Amount (84%)
Consulting Services	\$24,900	\$20,916
Broward County Planning Council application fee	\$12,146	\$10,202
Broward County School Board application fee	\$1,796	\$1,508
MPO review (cost recovery fee)	\$1,500	\$1,260
Public Notices / Mailings	\$1,000	\$840
TOTAL	\$41,342	\$34,726

Strategic Connection

This item is a *Press Play Fort Lauderdale Strategic Plan 2018* initiative, included within the Infrastructure Cylinder of Excellence, specifically advancing:

- Goal 1: Be a pedestrian friendly, multi-modal City.
- Objective 2: Integrate transportation land use and planning to create a walkable and bikeable community.

This item advances the *Fast Forward Fort Lauderdale 2035 Vision Plan: We Are Connected*.

cc: Lee R. Feldman, ICMA-CM, City Manager
 Susanne M. Torriente, Assistant City Manager
 Greg Brewton, Sustainable Development Director
 Jenni Morejon, Sustainable Development Director-Designee
 Todd Okolichany, Principal Planner

CENTRAL BEACH RAC BUILD OUT ANALYSIS

VACANT AND UNDERUTILIZED LAND

Site	Folios No.	General Location	Beach CRA	Size (sq ft)	Size (acres)	Current Use	Zoning District	Notes
1	504201140100 504201140090 504201140080	2828 E SUNRISE BLVD	N	5,000 5,000 5,000	0.34	Surface Parking	SLA	
2	504201140060	2882 E SUNRISE BLVD	N	5,000	0.11	Surface Parking	SLA	
3	504201280010	915 E SUNRISE LN	N	51,295	1.17	Surface & Structured Parking	SLA	
4	504201000020	3120 NE 9th ST	N	9,877	0.22	Surface Parking	SLA	
5	504201060130 504201060120 504201060110 504201060100 504201060140	NW corner of Vistamar & A1A	N	16,205 16,935 10,436 11,558 15,441	1.62	Vacant	ABA	
6	504201060330	2839 Vistamar ST	N	13,736	0.32	Vacant	NBRA	
7	504201060510	2800 Vistamar ST	N	50,982	1.17	Vacant	NBRA	
8	504201060020 504201060040	Belmar ST Auramar St	N N	9,866 10,866	0.48	Surface Parking	ABA	
9	504201060230	2900 Belmar ST	N	14,866	0.34	Surface Parking - Interim use	ABA	
10		NW Corner of Birch and Terramar	N	18,750	0.43	Surface Parking	NBRA	Condo ownership of land - various owners
11	504201040470	555 Antioch Ave	N	25,491	0.59	Vacant	NBRA	
12	504201040600 504201040610 504201040630	529 Bayshore Dr	N	16,493 16,340 16,340 17,993	1.54	Vacant	IOA	Various folios but same owner
13	504201040530	524 Bayshore Dr	N	12,500	0.29	Vacant	NBRA	Portion of the property is vacant
14	504201040380	Orton Ave	N	12,500	0.29	Vacant	NBRA	
15	504201040140	SE corner of Windamar and Birch	N	14,866	0.34	Vacant	NBRA	
16	504201040170	SW corner of Breakers and Viramar	N	14,866	0.34	Vacant	ABA	Vacant but some parking - not surface parking
17		SE corner of Seville and Birch	N	21,649	0.49	Surface Parking	ABA	Parking for condo bldg
18	504212101150 504212101160	1 N. Birch Rd	Y Y	10,000 6,208	0.37	Vacant	IOA	
SUBTOTAL (NON-CRA AREA)				456,059	10.45			
19	504212100520 504212010590 504212010580 504212010531 504212010550 504212010570	2939 Banyan ST	Y Y Y Y Y Y	25,000 6,103 12,475 6,103 10,075 2,400	1.42	Surface Parking	PRD	
20	504212010220 504212010240 504212010230	213 S Ft Laud Beach Blvd	Y Y Y	20,800	0.48	Surface Parking	PRD	Portion of property for surface parking Portion of property for surface parking Portion of property for surface parking
21	504212010770 504212010800	Almond Ave	Y Y	12,500 6,116	0.43	Surface Parking	PRD	
22	504212010060	401 S Ft Laud Beach Blvd	Y	48,000	1.1	Surface Parking	ABA	
23	504212010110		Y	25,038	0.57	Surface Parking	SBMHA	
24	504212010160 504212010190	431 Seabreeze Blvd 435 Seabreeze Blvd	Y Y	8,896 18,081	0.62	Surface Parking Surface Parking	SBMHA	
25	504212320010	550 Seabreeze Blvd	Y	34,299	0.79	Surface Parking	ABA	
26	504212340010 504212340020		Y Y	274,182 69,955	8	City Surface Parking	PRD	Las Olas Intercoastal Parking Lot
27	504212010210	500 Seabreeze Blvd	Y	60,008	1.37	City Surface Parking/Open Space	ABA	DC Alexander Park
28	504212270012	801 S. Atlantic Blvd	Y	1,691,573	38.83	Bahia Mar and Marina	SBMHA	Potential redevelopment of Bahia Mar
SUBTOTAL (CRA AREA)				2,331,604	53.61			
TOTAL				2,787,663	64.06			

Central Beach RAC
Development Potential
(general location map)

- Vacant Land
- Surface parking
- Potential Redevelopment
- CRA Boundary

